1899

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON.

The Remonstrance is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Maine, Illinois, Iowa, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

President.

MRS. J. ELLIOT CABOT.

Vice-Presidents.

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.

Secretary.

MRS. ROBERT W. LORD,
58 St. Stephen Street.

Treasurer.

LAURENCE MINOT,
39 Court Street.

Executive Committee.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN.
MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE.
MISS SARAH H. CROCKER.
MRS. JAMES C. FISK.
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS.
MISS E. H. HOUGHTON.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. G. H. SHAW.
MISS E. P. SOHIER.

Honorary Members.

MRS. OLIVER W. PEABODY.
MRS. PHILIP H. SEARS.
MRS. JAMES M. CRAFTS.

The Association was organized in May, 1895. It has 25 Branch Committees, and members in 164 cities and towns. Its membership includes professional women, wage earners, and home-keeping wives and mothers.

"THE COMMON ENEMY, MAN."

In her speech at the opening of the thirtieth annual convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association at Washington, February 14, 1898, Miss Susan B. Anthony is reported as saying: "The grievances which women have against their common enemy, man, to-day are as great and as many as the early colonists had against King George."

No one is better fitted to represent the woman suffrage movement in the United States than Miss Anthony. Her lifelong identification with that movement and her position as the foremost leader of it give her words special authority. The sentiment just quoted may be taken as expressing the fundamental idea on which that movement rests.

That idea is that man is the "common enemy" of woman; and that his injustice and cruelty toward her justify a revolt like that of the American colonists against George III.

Suppose that this idea were to prevail, and that women, armed with the ballot, were to try to wreak upon men, under Miss Anthony's leadership, their fancied grievances, what senseless disturbances would result! Could there be anything more preposterous than to attempt to array one half of the human race against the other?

Every sane woman knows that man is not her "enemy." She knows that in no age have women enjoyed so many privileges as in the present century; and that nowhere in the world are the rights of women more carefully guarded by law or more sacred in the eyes of the entire community than in the United States. Miss Anthony's declaration of war between the sexes is as truly a libel upon the intelligence of American women as upon the consideration and chivalry of American men.

LOSING GROUND IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The suffrage movement evidently is losing ground in Massachusetts, where for many years the agitation has been most active.

Propositions were introduced in the Massachusetts legislature last year looking to a suffrage amendment to the constitution, to the grant of presidential suffrage, to municipal suffrage, and to license suffrage; that is, a bill permitting women to vote upon the question of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors, which is submitted annually under the local option law. The committees to which these propositions were referred reported "leave to withdraw" upon all of them.

In the Senate this report was accepted without discussion; but in the House an attempt was made to substitute a resolve providing for submitting a constitutional amendment, and also to substitute a bill for the adverse report on license suffrage. On the first proposition the House refused, by a vote of forty-four yeas to ninety-seven nays, to substitute a resolve.

It is on the license suffrage proposition that the loss of suffrage strength is most clearly shown. This is a proposition which is calculated to bring out the fullest affirmative vote, because it is supported by some who vote for it under the belief that it is a temperance measure. In the legislature of 1897, as well as in that of last year, the report of the committee was adverse. But in the former year the House voted eighty-two to eighty-two on a motion to substitute a bill; and the bill was substituted by the Speaker's casting vote. It was afterward defeated, on a motion to order to a third reading, by a vote of 108 yeas to 125 nays.

Last year, however, on a motion to substitute a bill, only sixty members, counting pairs, voted to substitute; and 116 voted in the negative. Here we have a tie vote of one year changed to a negative vote of almost two to one the next year, on identically the same proposition.

ILLINOIS ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS.

The Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women held its annual meeting in Chicago, November 19, 1898, and the following were chosen officers of the Association: president, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin; vice-presidents, Mrs. Richard J. Oglesby and Mrs. Samuel L. Nickerson; secretary, Mrs. James B. Barnet; treasurer, Mrs. Horatio N. May.

THE WYOMING GAMBLING LAW.

THERE is given below the text of the Wyoming gambling law, which is interesting as a specimen of the legislation which is tolerated in that State, thirty years after the adoption of woman suffrage, with its supposedly purifying and elevating influence: —

SEC. 1459. Each and every person who shall deal, play, carry on, open or cause to be opened, or who shall conduct, either as owner or employee, whether for hire or not, except under a license as hereinafter provided, any game of faro, monte, roulette, lansquenette, rondo, vingtun, commonly known as twenty-one, keno, props, or any banking game played with cards, dice, or any other device, whether the same be played for money, checks, credits, or any other representatives of value, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than three hundred nor more than one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not less than three months nor more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

From which it appears that Wyoming intends that it shall go hard with gamblers who do not take the State into partnership in their games. The conditions on which the State will permit the unimpeded practice of any or all of the foregoing games are indicated in subsequent sections: —

SEC. 1460. Any person may procure a license for carrying on any one of the games mentioned in the preceding section, except as hereinafter provided, in any one room or apartment, upon payment to the sheriff of the county in which the same is situated the amount of license money fixed in this chapter.

SEC. 1463 directs that the amount to be paid to the sheriff for such quarterly license shall be $150, to be applied to the general county fund.

From this it appears that the State of Wyoming has no objection to gambling, provided that each professional gambler pays $600 license money into the county treasury. More than this, section 1462 guarantees the licensed gambler immunity from prosecution. This section describes the license to be issued, and provides that "said license shall protect the licensee and his employee or employees against any criminal prosecution for dealing or carrying on the game mentioned in the room described during said three months."

Wyoming used to be even more considerate of the gambling fraternity. Section 1465 of the law used to protect the gamblers against any local spasm of morality by providing that "no town, city, or municipal corporation in this territory shall hereafter have power to prohibit, suppress, or regulate any gaming house or game, licensed as provided in this chapter." This provision remained in force until 1890, or twenty-one years after the adoption of woman suffrage.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN AUSTRALASIA.

AN item has lately appeared in the newspapers which said, in effect, that "the progressive colony of Victoria had defeated woman suffrage by a majority of only one in its upper house, the lower house having voted in its favor." It was added that "the upper house, chosen under aristocratic conditions, would soon be compelled to yield to the popular demand made through the more representative and republican body."

This statement is misleading. Until about two years ago Victoria took the lead of all the Australian colonies in education and sound progress. At that time it was strong enough to resist the pressure of the socialistic and communistic parties that had possessed themselves for a time of South Australia and had introduced woman suffrage into that colony.

Victoria has now so far passed under their influence that the Socialist-Labor party is able to hold the balance of power there, and the introduction of a woman suffrage bill was a result. Representative government has two foes to contend with — extreme aristocracy on the one hand and extreme socialism on the other, and woman suffrage has found both these extremes friendly to its demands.

Proof of this fact could be drawn from political history from all countries, including the recent triumphs and defeats in our own land. But to confine instances solely to Australasia, it may be noticed that even amid all the radical experiments being tried in New Zealand, woman is not allowed a seat in either house of the parliament which she may help to elect.

In South Australia the *lower* house is elected by manhood suffrage only, while New South Wales, in which is the city of Sidney, Queensland and the progressive colony of Western Australia have no woman suffrage. Most significant of all is the fact that the conventions which have been held with the purpose of forming a Federal Union of the Australian colonies have vetoed the propositions looking toward the voting of women for their House of Representatives. Self-defense demands that non-combatants shall not share the vote at the point where physical force must be the final appeal, when any such final appeal is needed.

MISTAKEN GALLANTRY.

MANY legislators have voted in favor of woman suffrage bills because they supposed that women wanted them to do so. They have had no strong convictions of their own upon the subject, or, if they have been doubtful of the wisdom of the proposition, they have sacrificed their scruples to the supposed wishes of women.

Some time ago, a Massachusetts legislator, on being visited by a woman from his town, bearing a numerously signed remonstrance against a pending suffrage bill, exclaimed in surprise: "I thought all the women wanted to vote, and that is why I have been voting that way." Convinced of his error, he voted against the bill.

The claim of women who ask for the suffrage that they speak for their sex is wholly without foundation. They speak for only a comparatively small percentage of their sex: probably, in most States, not more than in Massachusetts, where, as is noticed in an editorial article from the Boston Journal, reprinted elsewhere, not more than four per cent of the women want the ballot.

It follows that if legislators wish to vote on the side of women, when suffrage propositions are pending they will vote against the bills.

UTAH'S POLYGAMOUS REPRESENTATIVE.

UTAH has signalized her advent to the Union under woman suffrage by electing a polygamist to Congress. It is to be hoped that woman suffrage is not immediately responsible for this, but one cannot help recalling the remark made by Mrs. Cannon, the only woman chosen for a State Senator. When running in the presidential campaign on the free-silver ticket against her husband, she said: "I believe in polygamy. I think the women of Utah think with me, that we were better off in polygamy. . . . Sixty per cent of the voters of this State are women. We control the State."

THE VOICE OF THE MAJORITY.

THE editorial article from the Boston Herald, copied in another column, comments upon the impression which was made upon the Iowa legislature last year when, at the general hearing on the subject of woman suffrage, the women who advocated the measure were met for the first time by women who were opposed to the change. The Chicago Tribune, as quoted by the Herald, predicts that the appearance of the anti-suffragists will arrest the suffrage agitation.

The suffragists are in the habit of taunting the remonstrants with their professed distaste for publicity, and inquiring how they reconcile it with their appearance at suffrage hearings and the presentation of arguments against suffrage. The taunt would have some force if the public appearance of remonstrants at such occasions were prompted by inclination. But it is at the call of duty that they go. The lesser evil, while still an evil, and one from which sensitive women shrink, is accepted in order that a far greater evil may be averted. This is why it is that in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, and elsewhere the long-silent majority of women, who do not want the ballot, are recognizing their obligation to make their position known.

It is better to undertake this distasteful task than to have thrust permanently upon women political responsibilities which they do not desire, and which it is not for the best interests of society that they should be called upon to assume.

WYOMING LIQUOR LAWS.

THE Woman's Journal quotes ex-Chief Justice Groesbeck, of Wyoming, as saying: —

Our liquor laws are *not* less restrictive than those of other States not under prohibition; indeed, our liquor licenses are very heavy, the annual licenses here being $800, and in other towns $500. The laws and ordinances are severe against the sale or furnishing of liquors and tobacco to minors, and against the furnishing of the former to habitual drunkards.

If the liquor license fees at Laramie are, as Judge Groesbeck says, $800, and in other towns $500, that result must be reached by local ordinances. The State law fixes the license fee (Section 1453 of Revised Statutes, reënacted in substance in 1890) at from $100 to $300 according to location.

But Judge Groesbeck is surely hasty in claiming that the liquor laws of Wyoming are as restrictive as those of other States not under prohibition. Massachusetts is such a State; it is a State, moreover, where women do not vote, and where only four per cent of them want to.

In three important particulars, the laws of Massachusetts are far more restrictive upon the liquor traffic than those of Wyoming.

The minimum license fee in Massachusetts, for what is commonly described as a saloon license, is one thousand dollars. No saloon can be licensed anywhere in the State, in the smallest town or in the large cities, for less than that sum, and the license fees actually imposed run up to two thousand dollars or more.

Massachusetts fixes an absolute limit to the number of licenses which may be issued. In Boston not more than one saloon can be licensed for every five hundred of the population. Outside of Boston not more than one saloon can be licensed for every one thousand of the population. Thus a city of ten thousand people can have ten saloons, but no more.

The Massachusetts law, again, submits every year to the voters of the several towns and cities the question whether they will permit the licensing of saloons under any terms. In any town or city where the vote is against license the only license which can be issued is for a nominal fee, to drug stores, for medicinal, mechanical, or chemical purposes. Under these provisions, about four fifths of the towns and cities of the State, of their own free will, annually shut out saloons altogether.

Other features of the Massachusetts law might be cited, for which there is no counterpart in the Wyoming statutes. The screen law, for example, which requires an unobstructed view of all licensed premises; the law closing all saloons on public holidays; the law giving an adjoining owner the right to veto the granting of a license; the law forbidding a licensed saloon within four hundred feet of a public school; the law making the owners of saloon property, under certain conditions, liable to the same penalties as their tenants, etc.

But without lengthening the list, enough has been said to show that Judge Groesbeck was ill advised in inviting a comparison of the Wyoming liquor laws with those of other non-prohibitory States.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE effect of the organization of the anti-suffrage sentiment among the women of this country has made itself felt not only in New England, but in the Western States as well. A short time ago the Iowa legislature had before it the question of whether the word "male" should be stricken from the constitution of that State. At the general hearing given upon the subject the women advocates of suffrage were met for the first time by members of their own sex opposed to this political change. The latter professed that they could hardly expect to meet and compete in what was, in effect, a public arena with women who had spent years in discussing and making speeches on this subject, as a species of professional pursuit. The suffragists seemed desirous, on the occasion of the committee hearing, to enter into a joint debate; but from this ordeal the anti-suffragists excused themselves on the ground of inexperience. They came, they said, to represent the homes, the contented family life of the country, and could not be expected to have that fluency and readiness in debate acquired by long practice in the art of public speaking. None the less, it must be said that in their addresses the anti-suffragists exhibited no slight amount of mental ability, and it is evident that they made an impression, by the fact that the Iowa legislature voted against the proposition of the suffragists. Commenting upon this, the Chicago Tribune has remarked, with not a little force, that the incoming of the women anti-suffragists into this movement is a most important change, and promises to put an arrest to the political success of the suffrage agitation. So long as it appeared that the sentiment of the women, as publicly expressed, was altogether in favor of having the suffrage granted to their sex, it was possible that a kindly and chivalrous regard for them would lead the men to favor this extension of the voting privilege; but now that it is publicly obvious that female opinion is divided, the legislators have the best possible excuse, and one which they are certain to use before taking any action whatsoever. The suggestion will be made that, before the women suffragists attempt to convert the male voters to a belief in their cause, they should convert the members of their own sex. To carry on missionary work in this direction will, doubtless, tend to take them out of the regular political field. — *The Boston Herald.*

DEFEATED IN TWO STATES.

THE energies of the agitators for woman suffrage were largely concentrated last year upon the attempt to secure the adoption of suffrage amendments to the constitutions of Washington and South Dakota.

In both States the issue was the same: an amendment proposing to strike out the word "male" from the constitution, and to admit women to the full suffrage on the same terms as men. An active campaign was made.

In both States the proposition was defeated, in Washington by a majority of about 10,000, in South Dakota by a majority of between 3,000 and 4,000. Out of about 74,000 voters who voted for governor in South Dakota, less than 20,000 voted for the suffrage amendment; and in the two States combined only 40,000 suffrage votes were cast.

This is the third time that South Dakota has rejected a woman suffrage amendment. The defeat of the amendment in Washington is the more significant in view of the fact that, when Washington was a territory, it had woman suffrage, so that, as the Boston Herald suggests, it may now be said to have spoken from previous experience.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE PETITIONS.

THE usual petitions for woman suffrage are before the legislature. They are petitions for license suffrage, for municipal suffrage, for an amendment to the constitution striking out the word "male" from the qualifications for voters, for a law permitting women to vote for presidential electors, and for a law permitting women to vote for all officers and in all elections not otherwise expressly provided for in the constitution. This multitude of propositions is put forward, presumably, in the hope that members who are not ready to vote for one will be persuaded to vote for another, and that a thin end of the wedge may be driven in somewhere, to be hammered further in later.

Up to a comparatively recent period, petitioners for woman suffrage before our legislature have been able to claim that they spoke for the women of the State. They assumed so to speak, and in many quarters the claim was accepted without hesitation. It is possible that some of them may still profess to speak for the sex, but since the vote upon this question at the election in 1895 the pretension is an absurdity. When the women of Massachusetts were asked whether they wanted the privilege of voting at municipal elections and were given the best of opportunities to express their opinions, only about four per cent of them declared themselves in favor of the extension of municipal suffrage to women. The petitioners for woman suffrage are therefore shown to speak for only four per cent of the women of Massachusetts, and the question for legislators to consider is the advisability of granting the demand of four per cent of the women, in spite of the indifference or the opposition of ninety-six per cent. Shall the ballot be given to the four per cent who want it, at the cost of thrusting it upon ninety-six per cent who either do not want it or are strongly opposed to it? That is the real question so far as the attitude of the women is concerned. And in this connection it is to be noticed that the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, an organization composed wholly of women, has now members or committees in one hundred and forty cities and towns of the State, and is rapidly growing.

There is another consideration which can scarcely fail to have weight with members of the legislature. They are elected to represent their constituents, and in the more numerous branch they are called representatives, in recognition of that fact. The woman suffrage propositions, any or all of them, involve a revolutionary change in our election methods and the possible doubling of the electorate. Presumably the members of the legislature will inquire what their constituents think of such a change. They have not far to seek for an answer to the question. At the election of 1895 the men voters of Massachusetts, by a majority of 100,000, declared that the admission of women to the municipal suffrage was not advisable. Every county in the State, and every councilor, congressional, senatorial, and representative district in the State, gave a majority against the proposition. There is no pretense that there has been any change in sentiment during the past two years. Every senator or representative, therefore, who votes for woman suffrage will do so with the knowledge that the majority of the voters of his district disapprove of his vote. — *The Boston Journal, February 2, 1898.*

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1896.

Proposed woman suffrage amendments to the constitution were defeated by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Iowa, and Rhode Island; and in California a similar amendment was defeated by the people at the election November 3. Municipal suffrage bills were defeated by the Legislatures of Massachusetts and Vermont; and a license suffrage bill was rejected by the Massachusetts House.

IN 1897.

In California, both branches of the Legislature rejected a resolution to submit to the people a woman suffrage constitutional amendment.

In Connecticut, the Legislature rejected all woman suffrage measures, including a bill to permit women to vote on the License question, and one allowing taxpaying women to vote upon questions involving the levying of taxes.

In Delaware, the constitutional convention, February 15, by a vote of 7 Yeas to 17 Nays, refused to strike the word "male" from the election clause of the new constitution. Similar action was taken with a motion to make the clause read "every citizen."

In Indiana, the Supreme Court, February 24, handed down a decision denying the claim that women have the right of suffrage under the existing constitution. The court held that the constitution proceeds on the assumption that the suffrage is not an inherent or natural right; and that this is the assumption of the framers of all the constitutions in the land.

In Kansas, a bill to give women the right to vote for presidential electors was reported adversely by the Committee on Elections, and the House refused to give it a place on the calendar for discussion.

In Kentucky, a bill permitting women to vote for school officers and to be eligible to the office of school trustee was rejected.

In Missouri, a resolution for a constitutional amendment conferring the suffrage upon women was defeated.

In Massachusetts, a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment striking the word "male" from the constitution was defeated in the House: Yeas, 53; Nays, 86. A bill to permit women to vote on the License question was defeated: Yeas, 81; Nays, 98. Propositions to confer municipal suffrage and presidential suffrage upon women were also defeated.

In Maine, the judiciary committee gave the petitioners for a municipal suffrage bill "leave to withdraw."

In Montana, the Legislature defeated a proposed constitutional amendment to confer the suffrage upon women.

In Nebraska, the House, February 8, defeated a resolution to submit a woman suffrage amendment to the constitution, 36 to 56, and the Senate refused to consider a municipal suffrage bill.

In Nevada, the Assembly defeated a woman suffrage bill by a vote of 5 to 15.

In New York, a resolution for a suffrage constitutional amendment was introduced in the Legislature, but did not reach a vote.

In Oklahoma, the House, January 25, defeated by a decisive vote a bill to permit women to vote in the Territory, and again, February 18, reaffirmed that action.

IN 1898.

In Massachusetts, the House, February 14, refused by a vote of 44 to 97 to substitute a resolve for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution for the adverse report of the committee to which the subject had been referred. By a vote of 18 to 74, with 42 pairs, the House refused to substitute a license suffrage bill for an adverse report. Adverse reports on municipal suffrage and presidential suffrage bills were accepted without a division. The Senate concurred in this action without discussion.

In Ohio, a resolve for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated in the House.

In Kentucky, the House rejected a proposition to exempt from taxation the property of women while they are not permitted to vote.

In Iowa, the House defeated a resolve to submit to the voters an amendment striking out the word "male" from the constitution.

In Rhode Island, the commission appointed to revise the constitution rejected all propositions to make provision for woman suffrage.

In South Dakota, a proposed amendment striking out the word "male" from the constitution was defeated by a majority of 3,285.

In Washington, a suffrage constitutional amendment was defeated by a majority of 9,882.